

## **REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1 and 3-39 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 9, 11, and 21 being independent. Claims 1, 9, 11, and 21 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

### **Statement of Substance of Interview**

Initially, Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for conducting an interview with Applicant's attorney, David A. Divine, on August 14, 2006.

During the interview, each of the independent claims was discussed with respect to representative independent claim 1. Dependent claim 9 was also discussed. Applicant's attorney presented arguments distinguishing the claims from the cited Frech et al. and Henningson et al. patents. Also, several possible claim amendments were discussed.

Applicant's representative understood the Examiner to tentatively agree that the features of dependent claim 9 are patentable over the cited documents. The Examiner appeared to be receptive to Applicant's other arguments, but indicated that they would require further consideration and requested that the arguments be presented in writing. Accordingly, without conceding the propriety of the rejections and in the interest of expediting allowance of the application, claim 9 has been rewritten in independent form and independent claims 1, 11, and 21 have been amended herein as discussed during the

interview. Accordingly, all of the pending claims are believed to be allowable over the cited documents.

#### **§ 103 REJECTIONS**

**Claims 1, 3-5, 8, 10, 11, 13-16, 21-25, 28, 32-35, and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,233,325 B1 (Frech et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,301,250 B1 (Henningson et al.).** This rejection is respectfully traversed. Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the rejection, independent claims 1, 11, and 21 have been amended for clarification.

**Independent claim 1** is directed to a method of providing audible caller information and as presently presented recites, among other things, “placing a second telephone call from a services node to the second telephone station via a second service switching point, the second call transmitting an audible message to the second telephone station” and “audibly communicating the information associated with the first telephone station to the second telephone station and, in response to the second telephone call transmitting the audible message, visually communicating the telephone directory number of the first telephone station that replaced the telephone directory number associated with the services node via the second telephone call and the second service switching point.” The cited combination of documents fails to disclose or suggest such features (assuming, for the sake of argument, the documents can even be combined as suggested in the Office Action).

Frech et al. is directed to an audible calling party identification announcement service, and discloses, at column 2, lines 15-46, that:

upon receipt of a call to a party having announcement service, the call is forwarded ... to a centralized service circuit node/intelligent peripheral (SCN/IP) ...; the SCN/IP at some point queries a data base with the received calling directory number (typically obtained by automatic number identification ANI) in order to determine the text version of the calling customer's name; ... the SCN/IP, in response to instructions from a data base, originates an outgoing call via the terminating switch to the called party ...; when the called station goes off hook, the SCN/IP plays a synthesized announcement of the caller's name, and waits for a signal indicating acceptance or rejection of the call; when the called station signals to the SCN/IP that the called party wishes to answer the call, the SCN/IP sends an indication to the terminating switch that the called station is to be connected directly to the calling station and the connection to the SCN/IP is to be dropped ....

However, Frech et al. does not disclose or suggest visually communicating a telephone directory number of a first telephone station that replaced a telephone directory number associated with a services node via a second telephone call and a second service switching point "in response to the second telephone call transmitting the audible message," as presently recited in independent claim 1. Rather, as acknowledged on page 5 of the Office Action, Frech et al. does not specifically teach "visually communicating the telephone directory number of the first telephone station that replaced the telephone directory number" at all, let alone in response to a "second telephone call transmitting [an] audible message."

The Office Action asserts that this feature is taught by Henningson et al. at column 10, lines 49-65. Specifically, the Office Action asserts on page 5 that:

Henningson teaches that displaying [i.e., visually communicating] the Automatic Number Identification (ANI) [i.e., the telephone directory number] of the caller' telephone station 38 (fig. 5) [i.e., the first telephone station] (fig. 11, item 168; col. 10, lines 49-65). This visually communication is in response to the system paging [i.e., the claimed "second call"] the subscriber (fig. 11, item 168).

However, Henningson et al. also does not teach or suggest visually communicating a telephone directory number of a first telephone station that replaced a telephone directory number associated with a services node via the second telephone call and a second service switching point “in response to the second telephone call transmitting the audible message,” as presently recited in independent claim 1. Rather, as acknowledged in the Office Action, Henningson et al. teaches that if the caller selects a paging option, the FindMe<sup>SM</sup> service “will place the caller on hold and attempt to page the subscriber. The caller’s Automatic Number Identification (ANI) information will be displayed on the subscribers pager ....” The Office Action has not cited any teaching or suggestion that the a telephone directory number is visually communicated ‘in response to the second telephone call transmitting the audible message,’ as presently recited in independent claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons, independent claim 1 is allowable over the combination of Frech et al. and Henningson et al. (assuming, for the sake of argument, that those documents can even be combined).

**Independent claims 11 and 21** are directed to an advanced intelligent network and to a system for audibly announcing information, respectively, and each is allowable for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to independent claim 1.

**Dependent claims 3-5, 8, 10, 13-16, 22-25, 28, 32-35, and 37** depend from one of independent claims 1, 11, and 21, and each is allowable by virtue of its dependency from the respective base claim, as well as for the additional features that it recites.

**Claims 6 and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Frech et al. and Henningson et al., in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,850,435 (Devillier).**

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 6 and 35 depend from one of independent claims 1 and 21 and, therefore, include all of the features of their respective base claims.

Devillier was cited on page 9 of the Office Action for its alleged teaching of “connecting the calling party with the voice mail of the second telephone station,” but fails to remedy the deficiencies of Frech et al. and Henningson et al. noted above with respect to independent claims 1 and 21. In particular, Devillier fails to disclose or suggest “in response to the second telephone call transmitting the audible message, visually communicating the telephone directory number of the first telephone station that replaced the telephone directory number associated with the services node via the second telephone call and the second service switching point.”

Accordingly, claims 6 and 35 are allowable by virtue of their dependency from claims 1 and 21, respectively, as well as for the additional features that they recite.

**Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Frech et al. and Henningson et al., in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,481,602 (Griffiths et al.).** This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 7 depends from independent claim 1 and, therefore, includes all of the features of that claim.

Griffiths et al. was cited on pages 9 and 10 of the Office Action for its alleged teaching of “playing ringing to the calling party until a timer expires,” but fails to remedy the deficiencies in Frech et al. and Henningson et al. noted above with respect to independent claim 1. In particular, Griffiths et al. fails to disclose or suggest “in response to the second telephone call transmitting the audible message, visually communicating the telephone directory number of the first telephone station that replaced the telephone directory number associated with the services node via the second telephone call and the second service switching point.”

Accordingly, claim 7 is allowable by virtue of its dependency from claim 1, as well as for the additional features that it recites.

**Claims 9, 17, and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Frech et al. and Henningson et al., in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,141,409 (Madoch et al.).** This rejection is respectfully traversed.

**Claim 9** recited that “at the service control point, querying a second service control point for the information associated with the first telephone station; and receiving the information associated with the first telephone station from the second service control point.” During the interview, Applicant’s Attorney understood the Examiner to tentatively agree that none of the cited documents taught or suggested querying a second service control point for information and receiving the information in the manner recited in claim 9. Accordingly, claim 9 has been rewritten in independent form and is believed to be patentable over the cited references.

**Claims 17 and 27** depend from one of independent claims 11 and 21 and, therefore, include all of the features of the respective base claim.

Madoch et al. was cited on page 10 of the Office Action for its alleged teaching of “at the service control point, querying a second service control point for the originating number,” the originating number inherently being stored in a database. The Office Action also cites Madoch et al. for its alleged teaching that “if no information is found in the database at the service control point, querying a second service control point for the originating number” and that “at the service control point, transmitting the information associated with the first telephone station to the services control node.” However, Madoch et al. fails to remedy the deficiencies in Frech et al. and Henningson et al. noted above with respect to independent claims 1, 11, and 21. In particular, Madoch et al. fails to disclose or suggest “in response to the second telephone call transmitting the audible message, visually communicating the telephone directory number of the first telephone station that replaced the telephone directory number associated with the services node via the second telephone call and the second service switching point.”

Accordingly, claims 17 and 27 are allowable by virtue of their dependency from claims 11 and 21, respectively, as well as for the additional features that they recite.

**Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Frech et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,404,875 B2 (Malik et al.).** This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 12 depends from independent claim 11 and, therefore, includes all of the features of that claim.

Malik et al. was cited on page 12 of the Office Action for its alleged teaching of “retrieving at least more than 15 characters of data from the database,” but fails to remedy the deficiencies in Frech et al. and Henningson et al. noted above with respect to independent claim 11. In particular, Malik et al. fails to disclose or suggest “in response to the second telephone call transmitting the audible message, visually communicating the telephone directory number of the first telephone station that replaced the telephone directory number associated with the services node via the second telephone call and the second service switching point.”

Accordingly, claim 12 is allowable by virtue of its dependency from claim 11, as well as for the additional features that it recites.

In particular, **dependent claim 12** recites “wherein identifying information associated with the first telephone station comprises: retrieving at least more than 15 characters of data from said database.” The Office Action asserts that these features are taught by Malik et al. However, while Malik et al. discloses “constructing an outpulse string” having over 15 characters and sending it to a Service Switching Point, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Malik et al. that the outpulse string includes “identifying information” associated with a first telephone station, or that the outpulse string is retrieved from a database, as recited in dependent claim 12. Accordingly, claim 12 is allowable for at least these additional reasons.

**Claims 18-20 and 29-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Frech et al. and Henningson et al., in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,400,809 B1 (Bossemever, Jr. et al.).** This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 18-20 and 29-31 depend from one of independent claims 11 and 21 and, therefore, include all of the features of the respective base claim.

Bossemeyer, Jr. et al. was cited on page 12 of the Office Action for its alleged teaching of “converting textual caller information to text-to-speech format by means of pre-processor,” but fails to remedy the deficiencies in Frech et al. and Henningson et al. noted above with respect to independent claims 11 and 21. In particular, Bossemeyer, Jr. et al. fails to disclose or suggest “in response to the second telephone call transmitting the audible message, visually communicating the telephone directory number of the first telephone station that replaced the telephone directory number associated with the services node via the second telephone call and the second service switching point.”

Accordingly, claims 18-20 and 29-31 are allowable by virtue of their dependency from claims 11 and 21, respectively, as well as for the additional features that they recite.

**Claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Frech et al. and Henningson et al., in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,363,411 B1 (Dugan et al.).**  
This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 23 depends from independent claim 21 and, therefore, includes all of the features of that claim.

Dugan et al. was cited on page 14 of the Office Action for its alleged teaching that “DTMF tones is detected in response to system prompts,” but fails to remedy the deficiencies in Frech et al. and Henningson et al. noted above with respect to independent claim 21. In particular, Dugan et al. fails to disclose or suggest “in response to the second telephone call transmitting the audible message, visually communicating the

telephone directory number of the first telephone station that replaced the telephone directory number associated with the services node via the second telephone call and the second service switching point.”

Accordingly, claim 23 is allowable by virtue of its dependency from claim 21, as well as for the additional features that it recites.

**Claims 26 and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Frech et al. and Henningson et al., in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,812,533 (Cox et al.).** This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 26 and 38 depend from one of independent claims 1 and 21 and, therefore, include all of the features of the respective base claim.

Cox et al. was cited on pages 14 and 15 of the Office Action for its alleged teaching of “retrieving at least 50 characters of information from the database,” but fails to remedy the deficiencies in Frech et al. and Henningson et al. noted above with respect to independent claims 1 and 21. In particular, Cox et al. fails to disclose or suggest “in response to the second telephone call transmitting the audible message, visually communicating the telephone directory number of the first telephone station that replaced the telephone directory number associated with the services node via the second telephone call and the second service switching point.”

Accordingly, claims 26 and 38 are allowable by virtue of their dependency from claims 1 and 21, respectively, as well as for the additional features that they recite.

**Claim 36 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Frech et al. and Henningson et al., in view of Devillier and Griffiths et al.** This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 36 depends from independent claim 21 and, therefore, includes all of the features of that claim.

As discussed above, both Devillier and Griffiths et al. fail to remedy the deficiencies in Frech et al. and Henningson et al. noted above with respect to independent claim 21. In particular, Devillier and Griffiths et al. both fail to disclose or suggest “in response to the second telephone call transmitting the audible message, visually communicating the telephone directory number of the first telephone station that replaced the telephone directory number associated with the services node via the second telephone call and the second service switching point.”

Accordingly, claim 36 is allowable by virtue of its dependency from claim 21, as well as for the additional features that it recites.

### **CONCLUSION**

For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 1 and 3-38 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and an early notice of allowance.

If any issue remains that would prevent allowance of this case, **Applicant**  
**requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to resolve the issue.**

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 22, 2006

By: /s/ David A. Divine  
David A. Divine  
LEE & HAYES, PLLC  
Reg. No. 51,275  
(509) 324-9256 ext. 233